

TEAM VISIT REPORT – CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT REVIEW 2

University of San Francisco School of Management

I. Team Recommendation

The team recommendation reflects the opinion of the Continuous Improvement Review 2 Team only. It will be reviewed for concurrence or remanded to the team by the Continuous Improvement Review Committee. The role of the Continuous Improvement Review Committee is to ensure consistent application of the AACSB International accreditation standards and processes across peer review teams.

Within ten days of receipt of this report, the applicant should send the team any comments and corrections related to factual information noted in this report. A copy should also be sent to the Continuous Improvement Review Committee chair in care of the AACSB International office.

A. Team Recommendation

Extend Accreditation: The recommendation of the Continuous Improvement Review 2 Team is that the accreditation of the undergraduate and master's degree programs in business offered by the University of San Francisco be extended with the next accreditation review scheduled for 2020-2021. Concurrence by the Continuous Improvement Review Committee and ratification by the Board of Directors are required prior to the confirmation of the accreditation decision. Following ratification by the Board of Directors, the applicant will be notified. The applicant must wait for this official notification before making any public announcement.

B. Subsequent Review of Team Recommendation

The Continuous Improvement Review Committee will review this report, and any response from the applicant, at its next scheduled meeting. The committee will meet April 10, 2017.

The Board of Directors will consider for ratification via electronic ballot the team recommendations to extend accreditation or revoke accreditation that have concurrence from the appropriate accreditation committee, as soon as possible after the accreditation committee concurrence.

II. Identification of Areas That Must Be Addressed Prior to Next Continuous Improvement Review

The next Continuous Improvement Review will occur five years from the original review year. With this in mind, the University of San Francisco should closely monitor the following items and incorporate them in your ongoing strategic planning initiatives:

- In reviewing the CIR2 report, it was not clear how other stakeholders besides School of Management (SOM) faculty and staff members were included in the strategic planning process. Please consider the appropriate role for students, alumni, the professional community, and other stakeholder groups in the strategic planning process.
- The School should continue to implement the planned assessment activities as scheduled, and pursue opportunities for improvement that are identified by its processes, showing evidence of effective curriculum management.

- The School should continue to foster faculty involvement in the management of the curriculum through appropriate governance of the AoL process.

III. Relevant Facts and Assessment of Strengths and Weaknesses on a Standard-by-Standard Basis In Support of the Team Accreditation Recommendation

Standard 1: Mission, Impact, and Innovation and Standard 3: Financial Strategies and Resource Allocation

Regarding Standards 1 and 3, the CIRC requested that the school, “Articulate a clear strategic plan that identifies strategic objectives, action steps, responsibilities, and timelines as well as resources.” The review team is impressed with the strategic planning work the SOM has been able to accomplish since April, 2016, beginning its work on strategic planning even before receiving its decision letter from the CIRC.

In a relatively short period of time, including work over the summer months of 2016, the school has put together a very solid strategic plan built around four strategic objectives. These objectives are appropriate and achievable given the mission of the school. Furthermore, Tables I, 2a, 2b, and 3 are exemplary in their clarity in linking strategic objectives, action steps, responsibilities, needed resources, and time frame. The team believes the school has satisfactorily responded to concerns raised with respect to Standards 1 and 3.

One issue that the team would like to raise is the engagement of stakeholders in the planning process beyond the faculty and staff members of the school. It was not clear how other SOM stakeholders such as students, alumni, employers, and other members of the professional communities served by the school were engaged in the process. The school should be prepared to describe this in its next CIR report.

Standard 8: Curricula Management and Assurance of Learning

The CIRC had also identified significant weaknesses regarding Standard 8. The most relevant issues can be summarized as follows:

- i. Lack of direct measurements of learning or use of inappropriate measures (group assessment)
- ii. Unclear purpose of using indirect measurement and lack of alignment with the program learning goals
- iii. Weakness of AoL governance leading to inability to execute curriculum management based on assessment measures

The SOM provided evidence, through its report, of having implemented a sound governance system for its AoL process, achieving an appropriate level of faculty involvement. All programs have explicit learning goals and assessment plans, including direct and indirect measures clearly outlined and aligned to the learning goals. The scheduled 2015/2016 assessments have been completed and guidelines for improvement have been identified. The SOM should continue to apply efforts to complete the planned assessment activities during the future academic periods, as well as to implement the identified improvement actions, showing evidence of effective curriculum management.

The SOM should be commended for achieving so much in such a short period of time. However, this achievement may also be a weakness in the sense that it is unclear whether the SOM will be able to keep the momentum of continuous improvement and faculty involvement with AoL over time. Therefore, the SOM should be prepared to provide evidence of this in the next CIR.

IV. Summary of Review

A. Continuous Improvement Review 2 Team Members

Joseph M. Phillips, Dean, Albers School of Business and Economics, Seattle University
Irineu G. N. Gianesi, Dean of Academic Affairs, Insper Instituto de Ensino e Pesquisa

B. Visit Schedule

A visit to campus was deemed to be unnecessary. However, the review team visited with Dean Liz Davis on February 7, 2017 at the AACSB Deans Conference in New Orleans, LA.

C. Materials Reviewed

USF Continuous Improvement Review Report (2) and Appendices